the non-hereditary offices may either be made pensionable or the appointments continued to the members of the incumbent's family.

Reply of Government.—Fitness to discharge the duties of the office that may fall vacant has to be carefully considered in each case before making the appointment. The grant of pension is out of the question.

Subject No. 39.
Arrangements for delivery of religious sermons.

Summary of discussion.—Arrangements may be made in all Devastanams for religious sermons being delivered once every day, week or fortnight.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

JUDICIAL (INCLUDING CIVIL, CRIMINAL, POLICE AND REGISTRATION).

Subject No. 40.
(a) A separate officer for Civil, Criminal & Registration work in each Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) A separate officer may be appointed for each Taluk for dealing with Civil and Criminal Cases in addition to Registration work, or Sub-Registrars may be empowered to deal with such cases, or Civil Courts may be ordered to be held once in three months in Taluk kasbas, to obviate the inconvenience and save the expenses to which parties are put at present by long adjournments in civil cases. Such adjournments may also be prevented by stringent rules and regulations.

Reply of Government.—The appointment of a separate officer as proposed is neither necessary nor possible. The representation as regards adjournments will be referred to the Chief Court.

(b) Frequent adjournments of Civil Suits.

Summary of discussion.—(*b*) The frequent adjournments of suits in Civil Courts cause loss and inconvenience to parties. There should therefore be a limit to the number of hearings.

Reply of Government.—*Vide* reply to Subject No. 40 (*a*) above.

Subject No. 41.
Fradulent transfers of property.

Summary of discussion.—Fraudulent transfers of or and the same property by sale, mortgage, &c., to severa persons must be prohibited and the persons so transferrin should be prosecuted.

Reply of Government.—The Government can do nothin in this matter. Redress must be sought in the prope Courts.

Subject No. 42.
(a) Licenses under the Arms Regulation.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) Final orders are prayed for on the subject of exempting sahucars and landholders and Members of the District Fund and Municipal Boards and of the Representative Assembly from the operation of the Arms Regulation.

Reply of Government.—Members of the Representative Assembly will be exempted so long as they hold office as such. The case of the others will be reserved for consideration.

V-231M99
M99
(B)4581

(a) Renewal of Arms Licenses and the License fee.

Summary of discussion.—(*b*) Arms licenses need not be renewed every year but may be contianed until withdrawn or cancelled.

Mr. Narainswami Setty of Chikballapur represented that the licenses may be renewed once in five years

Mr. Syed Saheb of Kankanhalli proposed that the annual license system may be abolished and the license fee levied like mohatarfa.

Mr. Srinivasaiya of T. Narsipur deprecated the provision for the renewal of licenses annually and the prohibition against carrying arms by rail.

Reply of Government.—The Government are not prepared to grant any of these requests.

Subject No. 43.
Investing Revenue Inspectors with Civil and Magisterial powers.

Summary of discussion.—Revenue Inspectors (*i. e.* Sheikdars) may be invested with power to dispose of civil suits up to Rs. 20 and petty criminal cases within their range, in the same manner as village Magistrates in British Territory.

Reply of Government—Not practicable.

Subject No. 44.
(a) Relieving Amildars of Magisterial work.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) The Amildars may be relieved of Magisterial work and a special officer appointed to look after Civil, Criminal and Registration Departments.

Reply of Government.—*Vide* reply to Subject No. 40 above.

(b) Relieving Amildars of Police Work.

Summary of discussion.—(*b*) Amildars may be relieved of Police duties, as failure of justice may result if the cases investigated by them are also disposed of by them as Magistrates.

Mr. Guru Row of Nanjangud in this connection solicited attention to the reply given during the discussions of 1897.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

Subject No. 45.
Separation of Judicial from Executive functions.

Summary of discussion.—Provision may be made for the separation of Judicial from Executive functions.

Mr. M. Venkatakrishnaiya of the Mysore City Municipality submitted a written representation on the subject.

Mr. Sivappa of Sorab Taluk said that it would not do to invest with Magisterial powers any officer in receipt of a smaller salary than Rs. 100.

Mr. Srinivasa Rao of the Chikmagalur Taluk requested that the provision may at least be made in some Taluks as a tentative measure.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

Subject No. 46.
Appeals to Deputy Commissioners.

Summary of discussion.—Appeals against the orders of Amildars may not be disposed of by Deputy Commissioners without giving the parties an opportunity of pleading their case. Legal Practitioners should be heard in Revenue Cases.

Other Representatives, however, opposed this proposal on the ground of the great cost to parties and were in favor of the existing practice.